My only point of dissent from S.'s views arises in the fourth section of the last chapter (pp. 227–231) with regard to his interpretation of a passage from Plotinus' *Enneads* as cited by Theodoret (*Enn.* 3.2.8, 16–26 in Theod. *GrAC* VI pp. 98, 69–70). In the preceding pages S. stresses how the justification on Theodoret's part of the socio-political *status quo*, in so far as it is determined by the divine Providence, is in substantial contrast with the vision that Theodoret himself presents of the Christianised Roman Empire as the achievement on earth of the Kingdom of Heaven. Theodoret, S. submits, in this way justifies implicitly even a tyrannical regime and discourages any attempt at revolt in view of a socio-political reform. Plotinus is the author that he uses to support his view. S. thinks that in this case too we have a deliberately partial reading of Plotinus' text in view of its manipulation: for, if read in its entirety, the text recommends turning to social struggle and political action in order to eradicate any kind of socio-political injustice. It seems to me, however, that Plotinus' point is rather that he who suffers at the hands of others does so because of his inability to become ἀγαθός, that is to abstract himself from the evils of human society and worldly reality by ascending to the higher level of the soul, in which he will become ἀπαθής like the gods (cf. *Enn.* 3.2.8, 13–16). In other words, he is once again advocating the idea that the really superior man is the one who looks at the struggles of the world as from the outside, with a sort of amused aloofness.

S.'s book is distinguished by its clarity of exposition as well as its thought-provoking thesis. It is to be hoped that it will prompt the interest of scholars of Late Antiquity to this kind of approach and investigation. The complex and fruitful interaction between Hellenism and Christianity is still to be investigated in all its depth. This work represents an important step in this direction.

University of Pennsylvania PAOLO DI LEO
pdileo@sas.upenn.edu

240 B.C. AND ALL THAT

SPALTENSTEIN (F.) *Commentaire des fragments dramatiques de Livius Andronicus*. (Collection Latomus 318.) Pp. 231. Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2008. Paper, €42. ISBN: 978-2-87031-259-9.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X11001132

The performance of a tragedy and a comedy written by Livius Andronicus in 240 B.C. to celebrate victory in the First Punic War marked, along with the same author's *Odusia*, the beginnings of Latin literature as we know it. Though posterity has been unkind to this pioneer's dramatic *œuvre*, and critics little kinder, there remain fragments in sufficient quantity, and of sufficient intrinsic as well as historical interest, to make a detailed modern commentary extremely desirable. S. provides an exhaustive discussion of earlier analyses of the fragments, supplemented by insightful and generally convincing interpretations of his own. Certain idiosyncrasies of style and presentation will render the commentary rather less useful, or at least less user-friendly, than it might have been, but it remains an important and, in its own way, engaging contribution to the study of Livius' plays.

The text is that of Warmington's Loeb *Remains of Old Latin*. It is perhaps surprising to find S. using this rather than Ribbeck, but the text is generally a good one and certainly the most widely available, in Anglophone countries at least.

Less satisfactory is S.'s determination to print Warmington's text even when he explicitly disagrees with it, or believes it not to be by Livius. In the light of his skilful, not to say trenchant, analyses of earlier readings and conjectures, one can only take his claim not to have an editor's competences as either overly modest or disingenuous. Hence, when he convincingly argues that fr. 15 should not end with a question mark, and that fr. 17 should read *uento* rather than *uerno* and fr. 40 *uocat* not *prouocat*, one would rather have his preferred text printed than have to scour the commentary. S. does not provide an apparatus criticus either, and it is often laborious, sometimes impossible to reconstruct from the commentary precisely the readings of the MSS and the various editors. Most frustratingly, in frr. 25–6, from the *Tereus*, it proves impossible to reconstruct exactly what reading S. *does* prefer, except that it is certainly not the printed text of Warmington. S. also prints the four lines attributed by Terentianus Maurus to Livius' *Ino*, and devotes eight pages of commentary to them, despite categorically showing that they are not by Livius (the all-but-universal critical consensus), finally stating that he has included them solely because of his principle of printing what Warmington does.

The commentary consists of detailed and mordant discussion of earlier analyses, peppered with S.'s own interpretations. S. shows himself a master of the linguistic and metrical complexities which are of central importance in establishing, let alone interpreting, the text. In discussing the interpretations of earlier commentators, particularly those of Bothe, Ribbeck, Warmington, Carratello and Traglia, S. is incisive and insightful, but also rather patronising. This can make for enjoyable reading, of the guilty pleasure kind, but sometimes feels ungenerous. Historicising critical interpretations is certainly salutary and illuminating, but perhaps not psychologising them, as when S. suggests that Ribbeck misconstrues a Latin word by associating it with a German false friend. It is not improbable that Ribbeck is occasionally 'romantic' in his reconstructions, Warmington 'puritanical' in his translations, and others 'naive' or prone to 'blunders', but repeated references to such failings and to S.'s 'astonishment' at an interpretation pall after a while. The discussion is also extremely expansive and leisurely, and could have benefited considerably from greater concision and the omission of repeated references to discredited interpretations. For example, Terzaghi's suggestion that the *Aegisthus* represented the murder not of Agamemnon, but of Clytemnestra and the eponymous villain, is sufficiently refuted in the preliminary discussion of the tragedy. His associated interpretation of each fragment need not have been exhaustively discussed, especially since several are dismissed solely on the grounds that the overall reconstruction of the plot is erroneous.

Although the overwhelming majority of his interpretations are judicious and convincing, S. is not himself immune to some of the assumptions and naïvetés of which he accuses his predecessors. In particular, his insistence that Livius' *Aegisthus* is closely imitated by Seneca's *Agamemnon* leads him to dismiss several interpretations which are otherwise, on his own admission, quite defensible. Conversely, he pushes what can be deduced from this assumption too far in assigning frr. 2–4 to a messenger rather than Agamemnon or any of the other possibilities solely because of its similarity to part of Seneca's messenger speech (p. 35), or fr. 8 to Cassandra because the latter's Clytemnestra and Aegisthus do not narrate the murder (pp. 50–1). One might also question his extrapolation of third-century Roman familiarity with the Andromeda myth from Ovid's elliptical allusiveness in the *Metamorphoses* (p. 84), or the mediocrity of Livius' comedies from the paucity of fragments (p. 181). Would one say the same of Varius' *Thyestes* or

Ovid's *Medea*? Errors and misprints are few and minor, but in the spirit of S.'s vigilance for critical 'bévues', one might note that it is the body of Pyrrhus, not Theseus, which is brought on stage in Euripides' *Andromache* (p. 70), and that, in the *Hecuba*, while Polymestor's sons are killed off stage, he himself is only blinded (p. 97).

In the preface, S. justifies his decision not to include a general introduction on the grounds that it is beyond the scope of the commentary and that the issues which it would cover may be easily found elsewhere. Yet there are regular excursuses integrated into notes on individual fragments discussing such topics as whether Livius' tragedies included a chorus (pp. 44–5), the grammarians' method of citation (pp. 53–4), the sophistication of the third-century Roman audience (pp. 59–61), and the choice of Greek models (pp. 73–4). Even though there are helpful cross-references back to these discussions, they would surely have been more usefully collected into a general introduction. This is particularly noticeable in the case of the two rather belated discussions of what does and does not constitute marked literary, tragic or archaic language in Livius. These do not occur until pp. 135–7 and 158–60, although the issue is raised in the notes on the majority of fragments before as well as after this. One might also think, both that general introductions to Livius are not so very easily accessible that one is not desirable in a commentary on his dramatic fragments, and that S.'s expansive style and compendious discussion of earlier analyses rather belies claims that the book's scope precludes such an introduction. The (explicitly justified) omission of a bibliography also necessitates much cross-referencing and attendant page-flipping, and it is particularly frustrating when even then (as with Klimek-Winter's *Andromedatragödien* on p. 83) details such as the author's first name, the place of publication, and even the full title are not given.

Inevitably, a review of a commentary will tend to highlight shortcomings rather than catalogue strengths, which cannot easily be summarised. The shortcomings of this commentary mask and mar its considerable strengths, but do not completely obscure them.

The University of Sydney BOB COWAN
bob.cowan@sydney.edu.au

SOME VIEWS OF TERENCE?

KRUSCHWITZ (P.), EHLERS (W.W.), FELGENTREU (F.) (edd.) *Terentius Poeta*. (*Zetemata* 127.) Pp. xii + 235, ills. Munich: C.H. Beck, 2007. Paper, €54.90. ISBN: 978-3-406-55948-8.

WRIGHT (D.H.) *The Lost Late Antique Illustrated Terence*. (Documenti e Riproduzioni 6.) Pp. vi + 226, ills, colour pls. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2006. Cased. ISBN: 978-88-210-0781-1.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X11001144

An international conference 'Terentius Poeta' was held in Berlin in 1995. The Editors declare (pp. vii–viii) that Terence needs to be seen as a 'maker' in his own right; Menander is firmly sidelined: he gets only 30 references, these mainly to *Aspis* and *Samia*, on only 16 of 235 pages. Terence's *Eunuchus* gets by far the